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How can governance design options be developed for new and emerging sports?

Systemic view of governance
(Rhodes, 1997; Rosenau, 1995; Shilbury & Ferkins, 2013; Cornforth, 2014)

The concept of design aligns well with a new and emerging sport.
Governance design elements of new and emerging sports

Stakeholders involved in the new and emerging sport. Roles and responsibilities, power and influence and participation in governance activities. Legitimate authority to govern. Potential stakeholders.

Issues and tensions

Structure

Issues and tensions

Stakeholders

Cooperation

Processes

Issues and tensions

Levels of cooperation in the new and emerging sport and associated constructs such as trust, inclusion and legitimising cooperation.

The totality of the new and emerging sport. The overall shape of the sport portrayed by the interconnections and patterns between stakeholders. Levels, categories, platforms and sectors of stakeholders.

Governance processes and approaches including but not limited to facilitation and coordination, decision making, communication, special initiatives and events, planning and committees.

Adapted from Vangen, Hayes and Cornforth (2015)
Sport New Zealand (2015) and the Australian Sports Commission (2013) highlight a number of **themes and trends** currently influencing sport.

- **Rise of lifestyle and alternative sports.**
- **Commercial sector** has created new ‘pay for play’ opportunities with no links to the traditional not for profit sport system.
- **The role of social media platforms to attract participants and build communities.**

Sport New Zealand (2015) suggests that sport organisations will need to explore new structural forms.
Kellet and Russell (2009) assert there is a dearth of understanding as to how new and emerging sports are structured and governed compared to traditional sports. Lifestyle sports such as skateboarding are fragmented, lack formal structures and contain overlapping roles of suppliers, participants and program developers (Kellet & Russell, 2009). Triathlon contains TPOs such as event managers who have ‘infiltrated the sport’ taking on roles normally assumed by the NSO to the point of rendering the NSO irrelevant (Phillips & Newland, 2014).
Cornforth (2012) asserts that the once linear boundaries between private, public and not for profit sectors are becoming increasingly blurred.

Governance research “has not adequately kept up with the changing context in which many non-profit organisations operate…” (p. 2).
Qualitative, developmental action research methodology

Seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice in participation with the board of the case study organisation, New Zealand Stand Up Paddling (NZSUP) to develop practical solutions to issues of pressing concern (Reason & Bradbury, 2001), namely those pertaining to the governance design of new and emerging sports.
NZSUP (est. 2013) - Kitchen table sport management
The research questions linked to the action research phases (Adapted from Ferkins & Shilbury, 2009)

1. What is the current context with regards to the design of Stand Up paddling in New Zealand?

2. What are the key issues and tensions regarding the design of the sport of Stand Up Paddling in New Zealand.

3. What design options, actions or interventions can the governing body consider and/or implement to enhance the governance of this sport?

4. What are the implications of the design actions or interventions implemented/considered for implementation by the governing body of this sport?
Phases 1 and 2: Issue identification and context analysis

Semi structured interviews
- NZSUP board members x 8
- Peak governing bodies for sport in NZ
  - Sport NZ, NZ Olympic Committee, Aktive Auckland
- NSOs
  - Surfing NZ, Waka Ama NZ, Canoe Racing NZ, Triathlon NZ and NZ Football (Futsal)
- SUP Event Managers x 4
- Other Event Managers – Ironman Oceania
- SUP retailers x 2
- SUP clubs x 3

Attend and record NZSUP meetings – 19 to date

Two facilitated workshops with NZSUP
- Mapping the sport
- Strategic planning

Secondary data
- Document Analysis
- Media Analysis

Reflective journaling
**Key research themes**

**Event Managers Dominating**
Sport delivery in an uncoordinated manner.

**Organic Growth**
with a mix of 'not for profit' & 'for profit' stakeholders.

**Belong to Multiple Entities & Communities**
Casual Facebook/text training groups, event communities, brand teams and 'pay for play' retailer organised coaching groups.

**Emerging Club Structure**
Large range in the degree of organisation/formalisation and volunteer commitment.

**Brands & Retailers**
Also involved in Sport delivery.

**NZSUP Nationals**
A significant stressor for NZSUP as a volunteer board. Little focus for anything else. Board contracted event manager in 2018 resulting in a $loss.

**Highly Digital Engaged Community**
Underpins most communities. It's all this sport has ever known.
Phase Three: Actions/interventions
Action/intervention #1

Build a digital infrastructure, establish and implement digital governance strategy to grow and develop the NZSUP community.

• Free NZSUP membership.
• Use digital platforms to promote, model, inform and develop the sport.
• Grow the ‘on-line’ digital community.
• Reframe what membership means in sport.

Embrace and promote all organisational forms from formal to very informal.

Foster a more ‘FLUID SPORT GOVERNANCE DESIGN’.

Embrace and promote all stakeholder types from not for profit to for profit.

‘For profit’ are not considered TPOs…legitimate part of the sport network.
Digital governance strategy

NZSUP is with Peter Jones and 2 others.

Published by Trevor Meiklejohn [?I] · October 19 at 8:01 PM ·

A time, a place and shared passion = good times. Kohi SUP morning paddle crew.

NZSUP shared a post.

Published by Trevor Meiklejohn [?I] · October 15 at 9:16 PM ·

A great day had by all at the French Bay Paddlers Open Day! Awesome effort to all those involved!
Digital governance strategy
Action/intervention # 2
Collaborate with event managers to develop National Championship Series.

- Move from the one resource intensive, loss making NZSUP run National event to four outsourced ‘event manger run events’.
- Informed by ‘collaborative governance’.
- Acknowledges the important role event managers play in the design framework of SUP.
- Creates alignment with leading event managers and adds national prestige to their events.
- Allows NZSUP to remain relevant and provide leadership in this space.
- Seeding pilot for future collaborative endeavours.
The collaborative process

- Highly collaborative from the outset.
- Series of face to face meetings facilitated meetings coupled with ongoing post meeting email conversations.
- Shared vision established.
- MOU developed – 100% input with highly collaborative terminology.

A spirit of collaboration underpins this concept with the desire of NZSUP to establish relationships with a number of event partners to deliver outstanding customer focussed, aspirational, nationally recognised events for New Zealand’s stand up paddling community.

- Agreed commercial model.
- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
- Consensus around previously cloudy areas in the sport – board classes, age groups, race formats and safety.
The launch – October 18, 2018
Adding to the conversation of sport governance design

• Traditional sport governance is underpinned by ‘concepts of direction, control and regulation’ within quite a rigid federal model of NSOs, RSOs and clubs that presents a number of challenges particularly around whole of sport cohesion.

• This new and emerging NSO still wants to be a legitimate NSO, however is proposing a more flexible and ‘fluid design’ that seeks to acknowledge multiple stakeholder types.

• Online communities and digital governance processes underpin this design.

• The shift from traditional concepts of direction and control to facilitation and collaboration.

Adding to the conversation of collaborative governance

This small under resourced NSO wants/needs to be highly collaborative and doesn’t need to press reset to recalibrate as per traditional NSOs.

Collaborative governance is a useful theory to frame this research.

• Potential to transform the complex situations or issues into more manageable situations or solutions (Nabatichi & Balogh, 2011).

• Brings multiple stakeholders together to engage in consensus-oriented decision making (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

With roots in public administration ((Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2012) builds on seminal research by Shilbury and Ferkins (2015) and O'Boyle and Shilbury (2016) who have explored collaborative governance in the traditional sport context.

Further extends this research outside of the traditional sport setting to the new and emerging sport arena.
Adding to the conversation of collaborative governance

In the same way a strategic planning process formed the platform to develop a collaborative governance approach in Shilbury and Ferkins (2015) action research study with Bowls Australia, this new event series forms the basis for instigating collaborative governance for this new and emerging sport.

If we look deeper into the event management field, from a network governance perspective, research has suggested events are highly collaborative multi-sector entities and that relationship building and communication are key leadership qualities (Parent, Oliver & Seguin, 2009; Parent, Rouillard & Naraine, 2017).

Ansell and Gash (2007) highlight the importance of facilitative leadership in collaborative governance by bringing stakeholders together and getting them to engage with each other in a collaborative way. This is exactly the role NZSUP (and me personally as the action researcher) is fulfilling in this research project.
THANKYOU